Re: 200.360.223 R.A. [redacted] c.s / J.T. van Dissel c.s. [D100816_I67007657]

Afzender stassen@uwadvocaten.nl <stassen@uwadvocaten.nl>

Naar verzoekschrift hof (Hof Amsterdam)<verzoekschrift.hof.amsterdam@rechtspraak.nl>

CC reimer.veldhuis@pelsrijcken.nl, w.heemskerk@pelsrijcken.nl, davine.roessingh@debrauw.com, pieter@acr.amsterdam, anton@ekker.legal

Datum donderdag 22 januari 2026 om 21:37

Honorable Madam, dear colleagues,

With this message, I wish to communicate a number of requests from the petitioners (appellants). These requests are related tot he provisions of the applicable procedural rules as well as tot he safequards for a public trial.

(1) With reference to the applicable procedural regulations in this matter, the appellants have made the following requests.

1.1.4.4

The appellants foresee that the time reserved for the oral hearing will be insufficient for a proper consideration of the case. For this reason, the court is requested to reserve more time, including at least one hour of speaking time for the oral presentation in the first round for the appellants' lawyer.

Motivation

Respondents (interveners) were requested by your court by email dated December 3, 2025, to address exclusively the admissibility of the appeal and the grounds for rebuttal invoked on appeal by the appellants. After this instruction was given by your court, the interveners submitted four statements of defense, to which the appellants' lawyer wishes to respond at the hearing in order to further clarify the appeal. Given the number, scope, and content of these statements of defense, the maximum speaking time of 10 minutes in the first round provided for in the procedural rules is insufficient.

The instruction from your court to the lawyers of the respondents dated December 3, 2025, does not alter the fact that the assessment of whether the appeal is admissible cannot be seen separately from the context in which the request was made in the first instance and now on appeal. That context should be clear to your court and the respondents, also in view of my email and letter dated December 7, 2025, to your court and the lawyers of the respondents. In my letter to your court dated December 7 of this year, I wrote the following in this regard:

'...This provides your court with legal and compelling evidence that the Covid-19 injections are in fact a bioweapon, which is also relevant in assessing the admissibility of the appeal. It is of utmost societal importance that the proposed experts are heard. The process is not fair within the meaning of Article 6 of the ECHR as long as these very experts proposed by the applicants are not heard before a judge....'

The lawful and convincing evidence in the possession of your court indicating that the Covid-19 injections are a bioweapon is not limited to the documents and files sent by letter dated December 7, 2025 (including video messages and reports from the witnesses/experts provided). Your court also has an appeal submission with a large number of annexes that serve as evidence of the claim that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project 'COVID-19: The Great Reset' of which the intimates are the executors. In view of all this, it is necessary for the assessment of the grounds for overturning invoked on appeal to also take into account the content of all this evidence in the possession of your court.

Moreover, in the case of an oral hearing to which appellants are entitled, it concerns a hearing of their appeal and not merely a hearing of the limited defense of the appellees. Therefore, the appellants' lawyer should be given the opportunity to fully explain the appeal, which involves much more than just addressing the limited formal defense of the appellees regarding the admissibility of the appeal and the grounds for overcoming set forth by the petitioners on appeal.

With regard to the defense of the respondents, the appellants expressly note for the sake of clarity that the respondents' defense is incomplete because the respondents should also have addressed the context of the appeal in much greater detail, in accordance with the instruction of your court, in order to be able to present a full defense concerning the admissibility of the appeal and the grounds for exception invoked by the petitioners. The fact that the respondents have failed to do so for reasons of their own should not affect the opportunity given to the appellants to explain their appeal.

Unavailable dates

With regard to the provision of unavailable dates, the appellants assume that the dates already submitted are still current. If this is not the case, my colleagues are requested to send an updated list of unavailable dates to the undersigned no later than this coming Monday, so that I can forward them to your court within the one-week period mentioned in the procedural rules.

1.1.4.3.

The appellants request your court to allow them to bring the proposed witnesses/experts Sasha Latypova, Katherine Watt, Michael Yeadon, Joseph Sansone, and Catherine Austin Fitts to the hearing so that they can be heard by your court, and to enable the appellants' lawyer to consult with them during the oral proceedings.

Given the international residences of these witnesses/experts, the appellants request that, in the event that one or more of the witnesses/experts they have proposed are unable to attend the hearing in person, permission be granted to establish an online connection with them during the hearing, visible and audible to the participants and the public. The court is politely requested to play a facilitating role in this regard.

Furthermore, the court is requested to grant permission for an interpreter so that the witnesses/experts brought by the appellants are able to follow the hearing, as these witnesses/experts do not speak Dutch. Respectfully, the court is also requested to play a facilitating role regarding this interpreter.

Motivation

The appellants have a significant interest in being able to bring the witnesses/experts they have proposed, because these individuals possess knowledge that is relevant and crucial for the assessment of the case and are able to further explain their statements and reports, which are already part of the proceedings, and to substantively refute anything the respondents might raise against their findings.

(2) In connection with the guarantees for a public trial, the appellants have made the following requests.

The appellants request that your court record the oral hearing in its entirety using audio and video in the courtroom and broadcast it via livestream, as well as provide the recording to the (lawyers of) the interested parties. The appellants also request that your court take into account a large turnout of interested members of the public and (international) press. In particular, the appellants request an exemption from provision 2.1 of the revised press guideline, which stipulates that only journalists accredited by the Judiciary are allowed to make audio and video recordings in the courtroom.

Motivation

Your court itself determines the order in the courtroom, not the communications department of the courts or the Council for the Judiciary. During the swearing-in of judicial officers, the judicial officer takes the oath that, insofar as relevant, he or she will be loyal to the King, and that he or she will uphold and comply with the Constitution and all other laws. The revised press guideline does not come from the King and is not a law. However, the press guideline categorically undermines the non-accredited press by the Judiciary. This limitation included in the press guideline has proven to be particularly harmful in Covid-19 (as a project and not an illness) related cases for the constitutionally anchored transparency of the judiciary, which is crucial for the functioning of a democratic rule of law. After all, transparency of the judiciary is a prerequisite for a fair trial, promotes legal certainty, and stimulates public debate.

The press accredited by the Judiciary has made a major contribution to the enormous censorship surrounding the (implications of the) substantive procedure pending at the court in Leeuwarden (C/17/190788 / HA ZA 23/172), the context of which is the same as the case currently before your court (Covid-19 as a project). Although that case has received worldwide attention due to the content of the procedural debate that should take place in that case, the Judiciary-accredited press reports on it little or not at all and does not report at all on the many pieces of evidence that are very easy to consult via www.rechtoprecht.online, the website of the Stichting RechtOprecht, which facilitates this procedure. The procedural debate in that case is therefore mainly about the questions of whether Covid-19 is a disease or a malicious project aimed at deceiving people and causing harm and suffering in order to establish a new world order (COVID-19: The Great Reset), whether the Covid-19 injections are a bioweapon, and whether the respondents are the executors of that malicious project (COVID-19: The Great Reset) and, in that capacity, civilly liable for tort towards the plaintiffs in that case who, as a result of being misled by the respondents, received a Covid-19 injection (bioweapon). The evidence in that case for an affirmative answer to these questions is, for those willing to see and hear, more than convincing.

The present appeal before your court falls within this same context, which is of such significant public interest that your court cannot allow restrictions on the openness of the judiciary, and there is a substantial legal and social interest in granting the appellants' requests in this regard.

I would like to hear from you regarding the above requests.

From my colleagues, I would like to receive, as applicable, an updated list of unavailable dates as requested.

Kind regards,

Peter Stassen

Stassen & Kemps Advocaten B.V.
Bezoekadres: Nachtegaallaan 6, 5611 CV, Eindhoven
Correspondentieadres: Postbus 7004, 5605 JA, Eindhoven
Tel: +31 40 2676260
Mob: 06 - 41663460
stassen@uwadvocaten.nl
http://www.uwadvocaten.nl

Stassen & Kemps is registered with the Dutch Trade Register of the Chamber of Commerce under number 17225491.

Any business communication sent by Stassen & Kemps Advocaten B.V. is confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected. If you receive it in error please inform us and delete it from your system.

Van: "verzoekschrift hof (Hof Amsterdam)" <verzoekschrift.hof.amsterdam@rechtspraak.nl>
Datum: dinsdag, 20 januari 2026 14:45
Aan: "reimer.veldhuis@pelsrijcken.nl" <reimer.veldhuis@pelsrijcken.nl>, "davine.roessingh@debrauw.com" <davine.roessingh@debrauw.com>, "pieter@acr.amsterdam" <pieter@acr.amsterdam>, "anton@ekker.legal" <anton@ekker.legal>, "w.heemskerk@pelsrijcken.nl" <w.heemskerk@pelsrijcken.nl>
CC: "stassen@uwadvocaten.nl" <stassen@uwadvocaten.nl>
Onderwerp: 200.360.223 R.A. [redacted] c.s / J.T. van Dissel c.s.

Dear legal representatives,

The court has received the statement of defense you submitted. I have sent a copy of the statement of defense to the opposing party and any interested parties. The court wishes to hear from the parties in this case. Accordingly, I summon you and your client to attend the oral hearing at the court. This will be held on March 9, 2026, at 11:00 a.m. at the Palace of Justice, IJdok 20 in Amsterdam. You must report in time at the information desk in the central hall. Please bring this letter with you. For the duration of the oral hearing and for submitting additional documents, I refer you to the Court Rules.

The requesting party(ies) and interested parties must be present in person at the oral hearing so that they can provide information to the court. Legal entities must be represented for this purpose by one or more individuals who are familiar with the case.

If you call or write to the court, please mention or quote the case number.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, you can contact one of the staff members of the court administration, civil law department, by phone. If desired, you can inquire at the administration about the names of the presiding judges on the day before the hearing. The administration can be reached on weekdays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. General information can be found at www.rechtspraak.nl.

Kind regards,

T. Fani

Coördinator Verzoekschriften

Griffie Handelsrekesten

088 36 11714

www.rechtspraak.nl

de Rechtspraak

Gerechtshof Amsterdam

Informatie van de Raad voor de rechtspraak, de rechtbanken, de gerechtshoven en de bijzondere colleges vindt u op www.rechtspraak.nl.